

*BEST COPY*

*AVAILABLE*

*In- Out folder*

# How We Can Win War of Words

BY HOLMES ALEXANDER

The United States never has a fighting war and never won a talking one. We deeply believe in our democratic way of life (so much so that we sometimes overdo it), but we've never been able to subvert an enemy nation, the way Communists do.

We never inspire any American mob scenes or have foreigners pouring out their blood for us or peoples do all over Asia and Latin America for the Reds.

Why not? Rep. Dave Fascell, a hot-blooded Midwesterner, is pretty heated about it. The key word of the investigation he's holding is "offensive." He wants to find out why we don't have a successful aggressive drive in the ideological phase of world warfare.

★

His subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements is assigned "to explore the U.S. ideological offensive" and it may take him the entire session.

It has struck the observer that the conservative critics of the Kennedy administration are useful and usually right, and too outnumbered to bring any order out of the chaos. Thus, I remember recently that the administration was likely to get rough on Fidel Castro, when some true blue liberal, such as Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois, raised a cry for action.

The same reasoning seems to follow with Fascell, who is a New Englander and whose investigation is not a quest for a scapegoat or a cry-

ing to make the Administration look terrible. It is the search for a formula.

"I don't think we've done too badly," Fascell says, in discussing the U.S. Information Agency, Radio Free Europe, the CIA, the military information services and the scores of American businesses and institutions which try to fight the non-military



Murrow

war against communism.

This country is not afraid of war — we've proved that. But we have failed to try to win in the new war. The economic, cultural and political war that we ought to win. We have to be ideological or ideological war. I want to

ask some witnesses, thus far, some fairly good reasons why we are losing. While no American leader would willingly accept the blame for the world's ills, some seem to be afraid to be honest about the reasons for our failure.

We do not want people to think of us as over-rich and slothful, yet neither do we want to deny that ours has been a civilization which produces abundance and luxury. We do not wish to hide the fact that we have racial dissension and that capitalism produces unemployment as well as wealth. But we do not want to flaunt these faults, either.

When we report the news through the Voice of America and other governmental media, the satisfaction of truth-telling may make us feel virtuous — as Ed Murrow testified. But whether it matches the ruthless and incessant vilification which the Communists pour upon us, and the boastful self-praise of their own institutions is something else.

★

One witness seems to me, put a finger on the nettle which Fascell will have to grasp if his investigation is to achieve any purpose. Henry Mayers, president of the Cold War Council, a private enterprise association of communications firms, told the committee that we must rid ourselves of the "disarray of patriotic propaganda war."

In brief, we are going to have to develop a very un-American set of dirty tricks. It will be worth watching to see if the Fascell committee agrees to make that sort of recommendation — or if the committee proceeds to